

that our Lord's preaching to the spirits in prison is only illustrative of His acts in the life beyond the grave until now, "until all sin and death, which is the consequence of sin, are destroyed." The writer is Mr. John W. Owen, B.A., St. Paul's, Adelaide. From Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. we receive a volume of more substance than any of these. It is by one who has already successfully dealt with eschatological subjects, Dr. Herbert Mortimer Luckock, and this present volume on *The Intermediate State between Death and Judgment* is a sequel to his book entitled *After Death*. It is learned, cautious, reverential, free from acrimonious polemical matter, and well-written. Dr. Luckock covers much the same ground which has been so judiciously pioneered by Dean Plumptre, but he adduces a considerable amount of new material, especially in the department of patristic testimony. As regards probation after death, Dr. Luckock believes there is ground in Scripture for holding that those to whom salvation has not been offered in this life may in the intermediate state have further opportunity of determining their everlasting destiny; but "for all those whose circumstances are such that the offer of salvation has been fully and adequately presented in this life, probation is limited; and there is nothing in Holy Scripture to induce even a hope that it can ever be extended beyond the grave." Both for information and suggestion, this soberly written and painstaking volume is to be recommended to all who are interested in the intermediate state.

MARCUS DODS.

BREVIA.

Mr. G. A. Smith's "Exposition of Isaiah xl.-lxvi."—This is pre-eminently a time which calls for fairness and tolerance among devout-minded students of the Old Testament. They may be divided into three classes: (1) Those who think that, criticism being of yesterday, and having as yet arrived at no solid results (or almost none), it is unwise for its adepts, even if Christians both in heart and in head, to popularize it; (2) Those who, denying both premisses, and believing that a bold, though not indiscriminatingly bold, policy is also the safest, feel it their duty to communicate the best things that they know to a public which is being sedulously trained to appreciate historical

as well as scientific inquiries; and (3) Those who are slowly feeling their way out of the first class into the second, and speak and act sometimes in character with the one and sometimes with the other. Faithful servants of the Church belong to each of these classes; let them tolerate one another in the fulness of brotherly love, as they are themselves tolerated alike by their common Lord. Let their only rivalry be, who can come nearest to Christ in character and in conduct; and more particularly, as interpreters of the Bible, who can show best how glorious are its truths, and how wonderful the history which is the setting and the verification of those truths. I can imagine that Mr. G. A. Smith's second volume may in some respects give a greater shock to old-fashioned Bible students than the first, because in it he adopts as a "result" of criticism what has either been undreamed of or ignored, if not derided, by most English theologians. In other words, he sympathizes with the second of the above-named classes, though I would not for a moment be thought to imply that he is prepared to adopt a similarly advanced position with regard to other books of the Old Testament. So far as Isaiah goes, Mr. Smith makes a claim upon the indulgence of many of his readers; but let me add that he thoroughly justifies his claim by the fundamentally evangelical character of his theology.

No one can, I think, be in any doubt as to what our author's theological foundation is. The Divine revelation handed on from the past is, to him, continually revealed anew in the present. He believes, not upon the authority of tradition, but on the ground of his experience, that the Person who is attested by tradition, and whose workings in the past criticism does but make more manifest, is as able to save now as in the times of the greatest organs of revelation. "Look at life whole," he says, "and the question you will ask will not be, Can I carry this faith? but, Can this faith carry me?" (p. 187.) True religion is, in a certain sense, independent both of facts and of books; it is a personal "conviction of the character of God, and a resting upon that alone for salvation" (p. 102). The frankness with which Mr. G. A. Smith states this position shows that he has drunk deeply of the spirit of the Reformation. He is not afraid of being thought one-sided. One cannot be always qualifying one's words. There is a time to preach the value of facts; German philosophical extravagances have been recognised as such even in Germany, and should

not be resuscitated in England. There is also a time to insist on the all-importance of personal experience. Even in parts of the Bible—the ultimate source of our tradition—we find recorded a revelation which was “recognised and welcomed by choice souls in the secret of their own spiritual life before it was realized and observed in outward fact” (p. 102). And as the religious value of historical criticism consists in its disclosure of the relative importance of the traditional facts, so that of scientific exegesis is in its illumination of that which is most vital in the articles of our creed, or, to use a phrase of the late Dr. Edersheim, upon “that which is orthodox in orthodoxy.” That this is, in fact, Mr. G. A. Smith’s view will be clear from the following passage :

“Men have always been apt to think of vicarious suffering, and of its function in their salvation, as something above and apart from their moral nature, with a value known only to God, and not calculable in the terms of conscience or of man’s moral experience; nay, rather as something that conflicts with man’s ideas of morality and justice. Whereas both the fact and the virtue of vicarious suffering come upon us all, as these speakers describe the vicarious sufferings of the Servant to have come upon them, as a part of inevitable experience” (p. 354).

To me the example given in this book of the appeal for the binding sense of doctrines to the true meaning of the Scriptures, as elicited by a critical exegesis, seems of much ecclesiastical significance. It shows that such an exegesis can render important service to Protestant evangelical religion, and thereby justifies me in appealing to men of this type of religion to take a more friendly view than they have as yet taken, at least in this country, of the newer criticism. I am far from undervaluing the friendly regard of the younger offshoot of the Anglo-Catholic school; the cause of the Scriptures is dear to me, whoever be its champion. But it does appear to me that the future of Bible-study must in the main rest with those who are not ashamed of the name of Protestant; and, so thinking, I welcome every indication of a diminution of the alarm with which the Evangelical school at first regarded (and not unnaturally regarded) a criticism which began with negotiations. This is not, however, the only lesson which this book has taught me. My own feeling has been that the cause of healthy progress could best be attained if a kind of “self-denying ordinance” were adopted, alike by those Christian teachers who are hearty converts to critical views, and by those who have

hitherto stood aloof from criticism.¹ I, for instance, as one of the former class, should have been satisfied in my preaching to treat Isaiah xl.-lxvi. as a whole (not merely because this view is supported by most critics, but because it is comparatively easy to make it plausible to beginners), on condition that my own step backwards were accompanied by a corresponding step forwards on the part of some prominent conservatives. Dr. Driver may have had a kindred idea when he assumed the unity of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. in his excellent student's handbook to the book of Isaiah. The fact that Mr. Smith not only does not so limit himself, but sees no need even for excusing his own freedom, suggests to me that the time for compromise may be over, that once more Dean Stanley's farewell Oxford sermon on "Great Opportunities Missed" may have been verified in the history of the Church, so far at least as the Church is represented by her official leaders.²

The "freedom" which Mr. G. A. Smith allows himself may be estimated from the following passage :

"We are therefore justified in coming to the provisional conclusion, that Second Isaiah is not a unity, is so far as it consists of a number of pieces by different men, whom God raised up at different times before, during, and after the Exile, to comfort and exhort amid the shifting circumstance and tempers of His people; but that it is a unity, in so far as these pieces have been gathered together by an editor very soon after the Return from the Exile, in an order as regular, both in point of time and subject, as the somewhat mixed material would permit" (p. 21).

At first sight this view is sufficiently startling. Not only does it destroy the belief in a well-ordered masterpiece of literary style, but it seems to open the door to the most unbridled license of disintegration. It has required the author's utmost skill to make his view plausible to ordinary readers; but his effort appears to

¹ I ventured to propose such a compromise in an article in the *Contemporary Review* for August, 1890, but in vain. One of our *unofficial* Church-leaders will, I am sure, sympathise with my regret—Professor Sanday, who has himself proposed a "self-denying ordinance" (the phrase is his own) for writers on New Testament criticism in *THE EXPOSITOR* for January, 1891. Will the opposing parties (if the word may be used) take notice of his proposition?

² That there has been large excuse for the aloofness of the leaders of the Anglican Church from what is called the higher criticism I willingly admit. And I hasten to add that some of the most honoured members of the episcopal bench have distinctly repudiated any wish to check free but devout investigation. The assumption however is generally made, that investigation is but of yesterday, and that we must therefore "wait." Hence the tacit rejection of my compromise.

have succeeded. An Anglican magazine-writer is so far taken in by surface smoothness as to say that the new commentary on Isaiah by Delitzsch is "perhaps more critical" than Mr. Smith's second volume, though certainly the latter may be described as "more critical than the first," and the two writers, Delitzsch and Mr. Smith, are "the two greatest commentators on Isaiah." This is a gratifying sign of the times. It may safely be said that no surface smoothness of exposition would, ten years ago, have made Mr. Smith's views palatable to such writers. It is only eight years since, in deference to the most competent and sympathetic of advisers (not themselves Old Testament critics) I refrained from introducing such conclusions as Mr. Smith's into my own commentary on Isaiah. Self-suppression could no further go; for the inevitable consequence was that in the recent resumption of the critical analysis of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. my own pioneer-work, summing up my own "provisional conclusions," lies buried and almost unknown in an article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Mr. G. A. Smith indeed does me the justice to refer to this work, but even he does not mention its historical position, in conjunction with my commentary, at the head of a critical movement.¹ When will scholars learn to put the date of publication after each important book to which they refer? Want of knowledge of dates lies at the root of many popular misconceptions. It is however only fair on my part to recognise in the most cordial manner the independent spirit in which Mr. Smith has worked. There may be some who take credit to themselves for having studied some critical question without having consulted their predecessors; a German or a Dutchman must forsooth have an anti-supernaturalistic bias. Our author is not one of these; he honours those who have worked before him. But does his acquaintance with these impair the originality of his views? No; it only opens his eyes to the facts to which, but for those writers, educational prejudices might have blinded him, and to the directions in which a solution of difficulties may possibly be found. And there is the accent of true

¹ Of course, Ewald and Bleek are my predecessors; but no one will say that these eminent scholars give as comprehensive a treatment to the problems of 2 Isaiah as my own article. I have long wished to return to this subject in a work on the present position of the critical and exegetical problems of Isaiah. The apparent simplicity of many parts of Isaiah is due to the conventionality which constantly renews its youth, alike in conservative and in critical theologians, and against which we all need constantly to strive.

humility in the phrase which opens the passage quoted above—"the provisional conclusion." Provisional every statement about antiquity must necessarily be; our means of opening that sealed book are so continually increasing, and yet remain, comparatively speaking, so imperfect, that the most gifted critic and historian must confess the "provisionalness" of his results. But is not this a reason for waiting till "criticism has said its last word"? Some respected Churchmen think so, in the case of the Scriptures; but so Mr. Smith at least does not think. In every book on Israelitish history and literature there must be error; it has not been the will of Providence that biblical scholars should enjoy a fulness of inspiration denied, doubtless for the best of reasons, to the biblical writers themselves. What is inspiration? To Isaiah it was

"nothing more nor less than the possession of certain strong moral and religious convictions, which he felt he owed to the communication of the Spirit of God, and according to which he interpreted, and even dared to foretell, the history of his people and the world" (vol. i., p. 372).

All the inspiration which a biblical scholar can humbly hope to receive is a heightened power of tracing the main outlines of the Divine education of Israel, and the gradual development in Israel of spiritual religion. This gift is conditional on a full recognition of his own limitations by the individual; it is in this as in other fields of divinely appointed work by co-operation that progress is made. Turning to the nine "insertions and appendices" which in 1881 I seemed to myself to have found in Isaiah xl.-lxvi., I find that Mr. Smith for the present holds the following conclusions, in which I can at any rate recognise a sufficient degree of truth to make them worth adoption in public teaching:

1. Isaiah lii. 13-liii. 12. "The style—broken, rolling, and recurrent—is certainly a change from the forward, flowing sentences, . . . and there are a number of words that we find quite new to us. Yet surely both style and words are fully accounted for by the novel and tragic nature of the subject to which the prophet has brought us" (p. 336). In the passage of which this sentence forms part, Mr. Smith's wonderful command of English seems to me to have carried him away. The theory rejected is at any rate put in a most unplausible form. Dillmann himself, with whom I agree, seems fairer, especially in a sentence near that quoted by Mr. Smith in his footnote on p. 338.

2. Isaiah lvi. 9–lvii. 13a. “Almost none disputes,” says Mr. Smith, “that [this passage] must have been composed before the people left Palestine for exile” (p. 409). The case, as Dillmann perfectly sees, is in the main analogous to that of Isaiah lii. 13, etc. It is even less worth while than in the former case to fight over the degree in which a later prophet manipulated (what need shock us in this word?) the work of a predecessor. Re-editing old writings is no modern or purely western invention.

3. Isaiah lvi. 1–8. This, according to our author, is one of three addresses, “evidently dating from the eve of the Return” (p. 396). A more comprehensive study of the post-Exilic period may some day lead Mr. Smith to doubt the correctness of his impression. There were many afflictions as grievous as that of the Captivity in the long and troublous Persian period, to which, but for Jeremiah xxii. 19–27 (certainly, as I think, a later insertion), its contents would at once be seen to refer it. That “pious souls in many lands had felt the spiritual power of [Israel], and had chosen for Jehovah’s sake to follow its uncertain fortunes” (p. 406), seems to me by no means made out, though I find a similar statement in Dillmann’s note on Isaiah xiv. 1, 2. Certainly the prophetic writer of the latter passage declared, at the close of the Exile, that Israel’s restoration would have the effect of bringing proselytes. But a later prophet knows that this hope has yet to be fulfilled (Zech. ii. 11, viii. 20–23), and Psalm cxxvi. 2 merely says that the heathen recognised the power of Israel’s God to help His people.¹ Nor can I think that the phrase, “to His gathered ones,” in Isaiah lvi. 8, has justice done it by Dillmann’s exposition, “to the remnant of Israel which He will gather.”

4. Isaiah lviii. For various reasons, Mr. Smith thinks it possible to refer this discourse to the Exile, though he sees no reason to assign it, with Ewald, to a younger contemporary of Ezekiel. “Surely,” he says, “there were room and occasion for it in those years which followed the actual deliverance of the Jews by Cyrus, but preceded the restoration of Jerusalem” (p. 415), when the people had to be prepared morally for the great opportunity about to be offered them. It is indeed most sad that we know so little of the religious and social condition of the Jews in Babylonia. We do know that chap. lviii. exactly suits the first century of the

¹ On the fulfilment by Israel of its “missionary purpose,” I may venture to refer to the sixth of my forthcoming *Bampton Lectures* on the Psalms.

Persian period ; and if other prophecies become more intelligible by receiving this date, why should we hesitate to do the like in the case of this particular passage ?

5. Isaiah lix. "At first sight the most difficult of all of 'Second Isaiah' to assign to a date ; for it evidently contains both pre-Exilic and Exilic elements. On the one hand, its charges of guilt imply that the people addressed by it are responsible for civic justice to a degree which could hardly be imputed to the Jews in Babylon. . . . On the other hand, the promises of deliverance read very much as if they were Exilic" (p. 423). The former of these observations is, I think, correct ; the latter needs expansion. "Judgment" and "righteousness" are certainly employed in the same way as in 2 Isaiah. But the language of Isaiah lix. 20 favours the view that the transgressions referred to in the earlier part of the chapter have been committed in "Zion," and not in Babylon. In other words, the author writes after the Return, but is acquainted with 2 Isaiah. He may, or may not, have written Isaiah lviii. There is a general affinity between the chapters, which almost requires the supposition of their contemporaneousness, but does not in the same degree require that of a common author.

6. Isaiah lxiii. 1-6. That this is written by the main author of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. is probable, according to Mr. Smith, because theophanies occur at intervals throughout the chapters, and because several of 2 Isaiah's phrases occur in this piece (p. 441). There is an undertone of doubt in this expression of opinion which is not only justifiable in itself, but specially suitable in a popular work like the present. For, in fact, on the determination of the date of lxiii. 1-6 depends that of the period, not only of the preceding and following prophecies, but also of Isaiah xxxiv. 1, on which Mr. Smith expresses himself with much reserve. In reply to Mr. Smith, I will only remark (1) that, if I am not misled by optical illusions, the love of theophanies is characteristic of the whole later period ; and (2) that the influence of 2 Isaiah will often account for Isaianic phenomena, as that of Jeremiah does for the Jeremianic phenomena of certain psalms.

7. Isaiah lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12 (11). "It must have been written after the destruction and before the rebuilding of the temple ; this is put past all doubt by [the language of lxiii. 18 and lxiv. 10, 11]" (p. 416). This piece of prophetic, or rather of liturgical,

writing is, from a critical point of view, one of the most difficult in our Book of Isaiah. In 1881 I had neither fully taken in all our available information on the Persian period, nor divested myself sufficiently of conservative scruples. There seemed to be two classes of passages in the section, one pointing to an early and another to a late date in the Exile; for the one Isaiah lxiii. 18*b*, lxiv. 10, 11, and for the other Isaiah lxiii. 18*a*¹ (illustrated by Isaiah xlii. 14) and lxiv. 5 (if the ordinary explanations of a corrupt text may be accepted). Upon the whole, it then appeared to me that we ought to give the preference to the former class of passages, which indicate that feelings of dismay at the desolation of the temple and of the Jewish cities were still fresh. The expression *בְּחִמָּה עוֹלָם* in Isaiah lxiv. 5 (if we may read thus, with Dillmann) does not *necessarily* imply that the Exile had already lasted a long time; this remark may be reasonably justified by *מִשְׁאוֹחַ גִּזְרָה*, in a psalm generally held to be Maccabæan (Ps. lxxiv. 3). A single year of separation from Zion might seem "an age" to pious Israelites; and consequently the period of national independence might be said, as in Isaiah lxiii. 18*a*, to have lasted "but a little while." But I now see how unlikely it is that a writing which stands among late Exilic and (probably even) post-Exilic writings should be a monument of the early years of the Exile. I was right however in holding it to have been written in Palestine, and I am sorry that Mr. Smith does not support me in this view. Still our new expositor's brief discussion of the subject will be very helpful to English students. The remark that "the man who wrote vers. 11–15 of chap. lxiii. had surely the Return still before him," has in it an element of truth. As our author finely adds, "He would not have written in the way he has done of the Exodus from Egypt unless he had been feeling the need of another exhibition of Divine power of the same kind." It was Psalm lxxxix. which first led me to question the correctness of the view which I had expressed in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*; but only lately have I been able to see my way to a satisfactory date both for the Maschil of Ethan and for the *tefillah* in Isaiah. It was Ewald who, in 1835, first suggested a highly probable date for Psalm lxxxix.; he changed his opinion afterwards, but at that time he referred this and other psalms to the end of the sixth or

¹ I venture for convenience sake to refer to my own commentary, in case Dillmann's may not be at hand.

the early part of the fifth century. Prof. Robertson Smith has since then adopted this or nearly this date for some of the psalms,¹ and Mr. Herford sees the plausibility of explaining Isaiah lxiii. 18 by the troubles of the Jews under Artaxerxes III.² This is, in fact, my own view. The objection is, that there is no evidence of a burning of the temple at this period. How I should meet this objection, I have stated in my *Bampton Lectures*, where this section of Isaiah is repeatedly referred to in connexion with certain psalms (see especially p. 130).

8. Isaiah lxv., which our author (p. 455) regards as Jehovah's answer to the preceding intercessory prayer. "What seems decisive for the Exilic origin of chap. lxv. is, that the possession of Judah and Zion by the seed of Jacob is still implied as future (ver. 9). Moreover the holy land is alluded to by the name common among the exiles in flat Mesopotamia ('my mountains'); and in contrast with the idolatry of which the present generation is guilty, the idolatry of their fathers is characterized as having been 'upon the mountains and upon the hills'; and again the people is charged with 'forgetting my holy mountain,' a phrase reminiscent of Psalm cxxxvii. 4, and more appropriate to a time of exile than when the people were gathered about Zion" (p. 458). It is also remarked that "the practices in ver. 5 are never attributed to the people before the Exile, were all possible in Babylonia, and some are known to have been actual then." If therefore chap. lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12 was written well on in the Exile, why (it is argued) should not chap. lxv., which is "logically connected" with that which goes before, receive the same date? Mr. Smith has condensed his proofs most admirably, but they are not conclusive. His exegesis of ver. 9 seems to me dubious; where is there any reference to the Return from Babylon? Throughout he has perhaps been too much influenced by Dillmann, who will always be consulted with profit, but who is, unhappily, not quite fair to critics of a somewhat different school. I have long ago corrected my own view of Isaiah lxv. 4-("who eat swine's flesh"), to which I was led by defective information derived from Prof. Sayce.³ But I adhere to my view of ver. 11. Though perfectly

¹ *Encyclopædia Britannica* (art. "Psalms"), xx. 31.

² *The Prophecies of the Captivity* (*Isa. xl.-lxvi.*), 1890, on the above passage.

³ Prof. Sayce himself indeed has supplied material for a different view in his *Hibbert Lectures* (p. 153). Cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 272; Hewitt *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, April, 1890, p. 439.

willing to be better instructed, I do not see how Dillmann can assert, "Jedenfalls führt auch dieser Götterdienst [Gad and Meni] nicht aus Babylonien heraus."¹ This great scholar is equally dogmatic on the interpretation of Psalm cxxxvii. 4. Mr. Smith does not offend thus; but it is, I fancy, nothing but a dislike to multiplying post-Exilic psalms which has prompted him to the assertion which he makes. I might say a few things on our author's other allusions to the date of certain psalms, but must in my concluding observations limit myself to Isaiah lxvi., with which Isaiah lxv. is clearly contemporary.

9. Isaiah lxvi. "Whether with the final chapter of our prophecy we at last get footing in the Holy Land is doubtful" (p. 459). Mr. Smith thinks that in lxvi. 1-4 the rebuilding of the temple is "in immediate prospect," while the rest of the chapter has "features that speak more definitely for the period of the Return." These features however, he adds, are not conclusive, their effect being counterbalanced by expressions in vers. 9 and 13. Now I should be most reluctant to dogmatize on either part of Isaiah lxvi. It is not inconceivable that both here and in Isaiah lxv. a later writer may have edited and largely added to an earlier work, or at any rate have introduced passages of an earlier work into his own composition. But upon the whole I am disposed to adhere to the view expressed in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*; and in my Lectures on the Psalms I have endeavoured to add something to the plausibility of my view both of Isaiah lxiii. 7, etc., and of lxv., lxvi. All this part, in fact, belongs (as probably do Joel and Zech. xiv.) to the troublous times of Artaxerxes II. and III. It is to me a matter of conscience to disburden the great prophet of the Restoration from the imputation of cherishing the morbid and conflicting thoughts which meet us in the last of the appendices to the Book of Isaiah. And here, with much regret to be unable at present to draw attention to its many beauties, I take leave of this necessarily incomplete, but delightful and in the best sense popular, commentary on the greatest of the prophetic books.

T. K. CHEYNE.

¹ On the superstition of the post-Exilic Jews cf. Zech. xiii. 2 (if post-Exilic); Mal. iii. 5; Jos., *Ant.* viii. 2, 5.